



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/889,126	07/11/2001	Christian Wettergren	64591-64607-EN/CMN	8110

466 7590 04/05/2005

YOUNG & THOMPSON  
745 SOUTH 23RD STREET  
2ND FLOOR  
ARLINGTON, VA 22202

EXAMINER

HENNING, MATTHEW T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 04/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/889,126	WETTERGREN, CHRISTIAN	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Matthew T Henning	2131	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 December 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 9-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 9-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 July 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

This action is in response to the communication filed on 12/07/2004.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-8 have been canceled.
2. Claims 9-14 have been examined
3. All objections and rejections not set forth below have been withdrawn.

***Title***

4. The title of the invention is acceptable.

***Priority***

5. The application is a 371 of PCT/SE00/00027 filed 01/10/2000, which claims benefit to US provisional application 60/115,488 filed 01/11/1999.
6. The effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claims in this application is 01/11/1999.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

7. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 07/11/2001 is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the examiner is considering the information disclosure statement.

***Drawings***

8. The drawings filed on 07/11/2001 are acceptable for examination proceedings.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

*A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –*

*(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.*

10. Claims 9-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Francisco et al. (US Patent Number 5,263,147) hereinafter referred to as Francisco.

11. Claim 9 recites a system for data processing a security critical activity in a secure management mode in a computer (See Francisco Abstract Lines 6-10), which computer comprises a processor (See Francisco Fig. 1 Element 1), handling devices (See Francisco Fig. 1 Element 25), memory storage means (See Francisco Fig. 1 Element 30), hereafter named resources; that the system comprises a security device (See Francisco Fig. 1 Elements 31 and 100) comprising a processor (See Francisco Fig. 1 Element 7) and signal generators (See Francisco Fig. 3 Element 321), a number of control means, hereafter named switches (See Francisco Fig. 3 Element 325), with signal receivers (See Francisco Col. 5 Paragraph 6 wherein it was inherent that the AMU control had signal generators and the AMU had signal receivers in order for the Control to have configured the AMU) arranged respectively between the security device and the pre-selected resources (See Francisco Fig. 1 Elements 31, 100, and 30), that the switches contain information regarding accessibility to and from the resources, or parts of the resources, hereafter named resource ranges (See Francisco Fig. 1 Element 102 and Claims 1-2), characterized in that the switch controls requests from the computer processor to the resources or resource ranges depending on the information contained in the switch (See Francisco Fig. 1 Element 102, Col. 2 Paragraphs 2-3, and Claims 1-2), and that in response to a call from the computer processor or the handling devices, the switches are activated by receiving a signal from the security device, enabling the security device access to and from the resources or resource

Art Unit: 2131

ranges selected by the security device, and denying the computer processor access to and from the resources or resource ranges selected by the security device (See Francisco Col. 4 Paragraph 3 and Claim 1 wherein the AMU has access to the requested memory, and the subject is denied access when they are requesting an access outside the subjects access rights), in that the signal ( $SG_{PM}$ ) can be generated only by the security device (See Francisco Col. 5 Paragraph 6 Lines 1-4), and in that the security device comprises a signal generator ( $SG_A$ ), wherein, when a switch receives a signal ( $SG_A$ ), together with new information (addresses, operation, data), the security device is able of altering the content of the information of that switch (See Francisco Col. 5 Lines 39-50).

12. Claim 10 recites that the information contained in the switches controls access to resources for requests from other possible processors contained in or connected to the computer (See Francisco Col. 6 line 68 – Col. 7 Line 4).

13. Claim 11 recites that the switches comprise a signal receiver by which it can detect which source is handling the computer, and that the switch compares this with the resource which requests access to a resource or resource range controlled by the switch, and depending on the information in the switch, enables or denies access to that resource (See Francisco Fig. 2b).

14. Claim 12 recites that the information in the switch enables the switch to control certain areas of the memory means are allocated to be accessed by the processor of the security device only (See Francisco Col. 4 Paragraph 3).

15. Claim 13 recites that the information in the switch enables the switch to control that certain resources are accessible by the computer processor when not in secure management mode, and only accessible by the security device when in secure management mode (See

Art Unit: 2131

Francisco Col. 2 paragraph 3 wherein the large address space mode constituted the non-secure mode and the segmented address space constituted the secure mode).

16. Claim 14 recites that the switches are hardware switches (See Francisco Fig. 4 Element 325).

***Response to Arguments***

17. Applicant's arguments filed 12/7/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

18. Applicant argues primarily that:

- a. Francisco does not disclose processing a security critical activity in the processor of a security device.
- b. The signal received by the switches from the security device does not deny the computer processor access to the resources selected by the security device.

19. Regarding applicant's argument a. that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., Francisco does not disclose processing a security critical activity in the processor of a security device) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). As claimed, the present invention does not support the limitation that the security processor executes the security critical activity. In fact, as claimed, the present invention is directed towards denying a computer processor access to a certain resource or range of resources, and allowing a security device access to the resource or range of resources. There is no mention of either processor executing a security

critical activity. As such, this argument will not be further addressed. Therefore, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive and has maintained the rejection presented above.

20. Regarding applicant's argument b. that the signal received by the switches from the security device does not deny the computer processor access to the resources selected by the security device, the examiner does not find the argument persuasive. Even the applicant admits that Francisco disclosed the security device denying the computer processor access to resources. This can be seen in the first paragraph of page 8 of the communication filed by the applicant on 12/7/2004. Francisco disclosed that the security device determined which resources the computer processor could access at any given time, and denied the computer processor access to the other resources (See Francisco Col. 3 Line 22 – Col. 4 Line 16 especially Col. 3 Line 66 – Col. 4 Line 4). As such, Francisco did disclose the limitation of the switches receiving a signal and denying the computer processor access to the selected resources. Therefore, the examiner has maintained the rejections presented above.

### *Conclusion*

21. Claims 1-8 have been have been canceled and claims 9-14 have been rejected..

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

c. Chang et al. (US Patent Number 4,937,736) disclosed a memory security controller for controlling access to portions of memory by multiple processors.

d. Reardon (US Patent Number 5,434,562) disclosed a method for limiting access to peripherals in a computing environment.

Art Unit: 2131

e. Wang et al. (US Patent Number 5,765,027) disclosed a network controller that selectively provides a local processor with more memory privileges than a host computer.

f. Vicard (US Patent Number 5,764,761) disclosed a method for selectively controlling access to specific functional devices by identifying a requester using a key.

23. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Matthew T Henning whose telephone number is (571) 272-3790.


The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (571) 272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.



Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Matthew Henning  
Assistant Examiner  
Art Unit 2131  
4/1/2005



AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100